

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated January 26, 2004. Claims 1-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-52 have been rejected. Claims 1, 2-3, 11, 15, 22-24, 30, 37, and 44 have been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, as well as to correct typographical and grammatical errors. Support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the specification, and in particular, in Figure 1 and on page 5, lines 13-18. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented. Accordingly, claims 1-52 remain pending. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner has stated that the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference signs not mentioned in the description or do not include reference signs mentioned in the description. In response, Figure 12 and the specification have been amended to address the objections. Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has stated that claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-14, 17-19, 22-23, 25-27, 29-33, 35, 37-40, 42, 44-46, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Jain. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to combine Jain with Steinberg to provide the present invention. Steinberg in view of Jain does not teach or suggest the combination of “determining values for a set of camera setting parameters that are optimized for the photo opportunity site to enhance image quality of a picture taken at that location” and “pushing the set of setting parameter values via the wireless communication to the camera to automatically configure the camera to take a picture of the subject,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Steinberg fails to disclose capturing an image of a particular subject at a photo opportunity cite. Applicants further submit that because Steinberg does not disclose this feature, Steinberg also does not teach or suggest “camera setting parameters that are optimized for the photo opportunity site” where the camera setting parameters are “pushed” to the camera to “automatically configure the camera,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Jain discloses a system that selects or synthesizes video images from multiple video cameras, where video images from each video camera can be sent to a central graphics and visualization station for editing (Abstract and Figures 15 -21). However, the system of Jain even when combined with Steinberg, fails to provide the present invention, because Jain also does not teach or suggest “camera setting parameters that are optimized for the photo opportunity site” and does not teach or suggest that these parameters are “pushed” to the camera to “automatically configure the camera.” If any information is pushed in Jain, the pushed information is either a request for video images (pushed from a master computer to a slave computer connected to a particular video camera) or a video image (pushed from the video camera to the master computer) (column 31, line 42, to column 32, line 16). Neither the request nor the video image

in Jain provide camera setting parameters optimized for the photo opportunity site. Jain even states that “minimal image information is exchanged” to require a very low network bandwidth (column 31, lines 42-45), which appears to teach away from the present invention.

Therefore, Steinberg in view of Jain does not teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited in amended independent claim 1, and this claim is allowable over Steinberg in view of Jain.

Independent claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44

Similar to amended independent claim 1, amended independent claims 11 and 22 recite a set of camera setting parameters optimized for the photo opportunity site, and pushing the set of setting parameter values to the camera to automatically configure the camera. Also, claims 30, 37, and 44 recite camera setting parameter values optimized for the photo opportunity site and using the parameter values to automatically configure the camera. As described above, with respect to amended independent claim 1, Steinberg in view of Jain does not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claim 1 apply with equal force to claims 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44. Therefore, these claims are allowable over Steinberg in view of Jain for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 3, 5, 9-10, 15, 20-21, 24, 28, 34, 36, 41, 43, 47, and 51-52

The Examiner has stated that claims 3, 15, 24, 36, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Jain as applied to 1, 11, 22, 30, and 37 and further in view of Tsushima; claims 5 and 47 as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of

Jain as applied to claim 4 and 46 and further in view of Squilla; claims 9, 20-21, 28, 34, 41, and 51 as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Jain as applied to claims 8, 19, 27, 31, 38, and 50 and further in view of Squilla; and claims 10 and 52 as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Jain as applied to claims 1 and 44 and further in view of Squilla.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. Dependent claims 3, 5, 9-10, 15, 20-21, 24, 28, 34, 36, 41, 43, 47, and 51-52 depend from amended independent claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44, respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44 apply with equal force to claims 3, 5, 9-10, 15, 20-21, 24, 28, 34, 36, 41, 43, 47, and 51-52, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44.

Remaining dependent claims

Dependent claims 2, 4, 6-8, 12-14, 16-19, 23, 25-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 38-40, 42, 45-46, and 48-50 depend from amended independent claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44, respectively.

Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44 apply with equal force to claims 2, 4, 6-8, 12-14, 16-19, 23, 25-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 38-40, 42, 45-46, and 48-50, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, and 44.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-52 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

April 26, 2004
Date



Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540